(29)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI S.R. NAYAK, CJ.

WRIT PETITION No.2071 OF 2006

PETITIONER		Anwar Ali, Aged about 40 years S/o Shri Sayed Ahemed Ali, R/o Mauohadapara, Raipur (C.G.)
		Versus
RESPONDENT	1.	Regional Transport Authority, Chhattisgarh, Raipur
	2.	The State Transport Appellate Trubunal, Chhattisgarh, Raipur.
	3.	Viabho Shanker Mishra Jai Hanuman Travelles, Devpuri, Raipur

---

Present : Shri Ajay Shrivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Yashwant Singh, learned Govt. Advocate for the State.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 20th April, 2006)

If I may say so, the dispute brought before the Court is rooted on technicalities if not for hyper technicalities. Above all, I do not find any legal injury to the interest of the petitioner by the impugned action.

The facts of the case, in brief, are as follows:

The 3rd respondent applied for regular permit for the route Raipur to Dhamtari on 07-06-2005, subsequently, he moved an application for amendment and sought the permit for the route Raipur to Rudri. The licensing authority, Respondent No. 1, having entertained those applications, ultimately granted permits to the 3rd respondent for the route Raipur to Rudri. That action has been assailed in this writ petition on the ground that the 1st respondent, Regional Transport Authority, Chhattisgarh, Raipur did not insist from the 3rd respondent to comply with the provisions of Section 83 of the

Motor Vehicles Act 1988. The records before the Court would show that there was compliance of the above provision in the subsance a technical departure in the procedure followed by the 1st respondent granting permit in favor of the 3rd respondent is not vitiated factor, be that as it may, I am at a loss to understand that the petitioner is prejudiced by that action. The counsel was not in a position to point out how he would prejudice by the above action of the 1st respondent. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed.

Sd/-
Chief Justice